UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,848	11/24/2003	John J. Viola	63134/P001CP2/10309809	3611

29053	7590	11/28/2006

DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER
DWIVEDI, MAHESH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/720,848	VIOLA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mahesh H. Dwivedi	2168	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 September 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed on 09/19/2006, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that
form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-11, 15-19, 25, 32-39, 47-50, 52, and 54 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Michael** (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0070076).

4.   Regarding claim 1, **Michael** teaches a method comprising:

A) providing electronic access to a plurality of databases (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41,
Figure 1);

B) accepting search information vector data from a user (Paragraphs 43 and 49);

C) utilizing said information vector data to access at least one database of said plurality
of databases to identify at least a portion of said useful data therein (Paragraphs 43 and
49); and

D) utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data from said at least one database to
access at least another database of said plurality of databases to identify another
portion of said useful data therein, wherein said utilizing said at least a portion of said
useful data are performed automatically without input from said user to direct access
with respect to said at least another database (Paragraphs 39, 41, 43, and 49).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"providing electronic access to a plurality of databases"** as "The system includes a computing system 21 in communication with a plurality of law enforcement agencies 22, 24, and 26" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41). The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"accepting search information vector data from a user"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"utilizing said information vector data to access at least one database of said plurality of databases to identify at least a portion of said useful data therein"** as "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data from said at least one database to access at least another database of said plurality of databases to identify another portion of said useful data therein, wherein said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data are performed automatically without input from said user to direct access with respect to said at least another database"** as "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that **Michael's** method clearly compiles data from

various law enforcement agencies (see input terminals provide/receive data) to
prospective users for querying.

Regarding claim 2, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise a plurality of law enforcement
databases (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, Figure 1).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases
comprise a plurality of law enforcement databases"** as "For example, law
enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement
24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement
agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30,
32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to
provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The
computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the
plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph
41).

Regarding claim 5, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein ones of said plurality of databases are geographically dispersed
(Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, Figure 1).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein ones of said plurality of
databases are geographically dispersed"** as "For example, law enforcement agency
22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of
Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of
Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a
plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40,
and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive
data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21
also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law

enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41). The examiner further notes that since the databases may be law enforcement databases from all over the country, then they are **"geographically dispersed"**.

Regarding claim 6, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said electronic access is provided at least in part through a justice information network (Paragraphs 37, and 39-41).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said electronic access is provided at least in part through a justice information network"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "Each input terminal may be wired directly to the computing system 21 or communicate via wireless communications" (Paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 7, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said justice information network provides information communication between a plurality of information management systems disposed at different sites for providing data processing functionality for associated ones of said different sites (Paragraph 37, and 39-41).

The examiner notes that Michael teaches **"wherein said justice information network provides information communication between a plurality of information management systems disposed at different sites for providing data processing functionality for associated ones of said different sites"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement

agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "Each input terminal may be wired directly to the computing system 21 or communicate via wireless communications" (Paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 8, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said different sites include sites selected from the group consisting of government offices, investigative services, and prison facilities (Paragraph 37).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said different sites include sites selected from the group consisting of government offices, investigative services, and prison facilities"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37).

Regarding claim 10, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise inmate information (Paragraph 55).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise inmate information"** as "Although system 20 is geared primarily for law enforcement agencies and the transfer of data relating to criminal offenders, suspects or persons incarcerated by the law enforcement agencies" (Paragraph 55).

Regarding claim 11, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise suspect information (Paragraphs 37 and 55, Figure 7-8).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise**

suspect information" as "Although system 20 is geared primarily for law enforcement agencies and the transfer of data relating to criminal offenders, suspects or persons incarcerated by the law enforcement agencies" (Paragraph 55).

Regarding claim 15, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise public data information (Paragraph 45, Figure 7).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise public data information"** as "Charge" (Figure 7) and "Date of booking" (Figure 7).

Regarding claim 16, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data is identified by a confluence of search information vectors (Paragraph 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said at least a portion of said useful data is identified by a confluence of search information vectors"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for.

Regarding claim 17, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said another portion of said useful data is identified by a confluence of search information vectors (Paragraph 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said another portion of said useful data is identified by a confluence of search information vectors"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12),

"Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for.

Regarding claim 18, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) presenting said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data to said user (Paragraph 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"presenting said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data to said user"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict search results presented to a user.

Regarding claim 19, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented graphically (Paragraphs 49-50, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented graphically"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict search results presented to a user via a graphical user interface.

Regarding claim 25, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented to said user as a dossier of an individual (Figure 12).

The examiner notes that Figure 12 depicts all of the pertinent information needed by users about inmates and suspects in a table.

Regarding claim 32, **Michael** teaches a method comprising:

A) utilizing a plurality of search information vectors to identify data in said at least one database relevant to a particular query, wherein search information vectors of said plurality of search information vectors are associated with a different search direction (Paragraphs 39, 41, 43, and 49); and

B) identifying confluence of search information vectors of said plurality of search information vectors with respect to said relevant data within said at least one database (Paragraphs 43 and 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"utilizing a plurality of search information vectors to identify data in said at least one database relevant to a particular query, wherein search information vectors of said plurality of search information vectors are associated with a different search direction"** as "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that **Michael's** method clearly compiles data from various law enforcement agencies (see input terminals provide/receive data) to prospective users for querying. The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"identifying confluence of search information vectors of said plurality of search information vectors with respect to said relevant data within said at least one database"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for.

Regarding claim 33, **Michael** teaches a method comprising:

A) utilizing said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified to access another database and identify data relevant to said particular query (Paragraphs 47, and 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"utilizing said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified to access another database and identify data relevant to said particular query"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for.

Regarding claim 34, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said at least one electronic database comprises a plurality of law enforcement databases (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, Figure 1).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said at least one electronic database comprises a plurality of law enforcement databases"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41).

Regarding claim 35, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein ones of said plurality of law enforcement databases are geographically dispersed (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, Figure 1).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein ones of said plurality of databases are geographically dispersed"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41). The examiner further notes that since the databases may be law enforcement databases from all over the country, then they are **"geographically dispersed"**.

Regarding claim 36, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least one electronic database further comprises a public records database (Paragraph 45, Figure 7).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said at least one electronic database further comprises a public records database"** as "Charge" (Figure 7) and "Date of booking" (Figure 7).

Regarding claim 37, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said plurality of search information vectors comprise at least two search information vectors selected from the group consisting of contacts information, inmate information, suspect information, end party information, flow of funds information, initial contact information, and public data information (Paragraph 55).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said plurality of search information vectors comprise at least two search information vectors selected from the group consisting of contacts information, inmate information, suspect**

information, end party information, flow of funds information, initial contact
information, and public data information" as "Although system 20 is geared primarily
for law enforcement agencies and the transfer of data relating to criminal offenders,
suspects or persons incarcerated by the law enforcement agencies" (Paragraph 55).

Regarding claim 38, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) presenting said relevant data for which said confluence of search information
vectors are identified to a user (Paragraph 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"presenting said relevant data for
which said confluence of search information vectors are identified to a user"** as
"By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for
individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph
49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12),
"Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict search
results presented to a user.

Regarding claim 39, **Michael** further teaches a method comprising:
A) wherein said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors
are identified is presented graphically (Paragraphs 49-50, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said at least a portion of
said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented
graphically"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20
may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of
data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor"
(Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict
search results presented to a user via a graphical user interface.

Regarding claim 47, **Michael** teaches a system comprising:
A) a plurality of geographically dispersed databases, at least some of said databases
controlled by different enterprises (37-39, and 41, Figure 1); and

B) a communication system for allowing said user to formulate said query using multidirectional information vectors, said communication system operable to identify data directly relevant to at least one of said information vectors (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, and 49, Figures 7-12);

C) said communication system further operable to identify data indirectly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors using said data identified as directly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors (Paragraphs 37-39, and 41, and 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"a plurality of geographically dispersed databases, at least some of said databases controlled by different enterprises"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41). The examiner further notes that since the databases may be law enforcement databases from all over the country, then they are **"geographically dispersed"**. The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"a communication system for allowing said user to formulate said query using multidirectional information vectors, said communication system operable to identify data directly relevant to at least one of said information vectors"** as Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law

enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that **Michael** teaches **"said communication system further operable to identify data indirectly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors using said data identified as directly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors"** as Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).

Regarding claim 48, **Michael** further teaches a system comprising:
A) wherein said communication system recognizes a confluence of a plurality of said information vectors in identifying said data directly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors (Paragraph 49, Figures 7-12).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said communication system recognizes a confluence of a plurality of said information vectors in identifying said data directly relevant to said at least one of said information vectors"** as "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for.

Regarding claim 49, **Michael** further teaches a system comprising:
A) a justice information network providing information communication between a plurality of information management systems disposed at different sites (Paragraphs 37, and 39-41).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"a justice information network providing information communication between a plurality of information management systems disposed at different sites"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), and "Each input terminal may be wired directly to the computing system 21 or communicate via wireless communications" (Paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 50, **Michael** further teaches a system comprising:
A) wherein said different sites include sites selected from the group consisting of government offices, investigative services, and prison facilities (Paragraph 37).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said different sites include sites selected from the group consisting of government offices, investigative services, and prison facilities"** as "For example, law enforcement agency 22 may be the City of Dallas Police Department, law enforcement 24 may be the City of Chicago Police department, and law agency 26 may be the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)" (Paragraph 37).

Regarding claim 52, **Michael** further teaches a system comprising:
A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise an inmate records database (Paragraph 55).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise an inmate records database"** as "Although system 20 is geared primarily for law enforcement agencies and the transfer of data relating to criminal offenders, suspects or persons incarcerated by the law enforcement agencies" (Paragraph 55).

Regarding claim 54, **Michael** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise a public records database (Paragraph 45, Figure 7).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise a public records database"** as "Charge" (Figure 7) and "Date of booking" (Figure 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 3, 9, 12, 14, 20-24, 26-31, 40-46 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Michael** (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0070076) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-11, 15-19, 25, 32-39, 47-50, 52, and 54 and in view of **Crites et al.** (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0126470).

8.   Regarding claims 3, **Michael** teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise an inmate records database (Paragraph 55).

The examiner notes that **Michael** teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise an inmate records database"** as "Although system 20 is geared primarily for law enforcement agencies and the transfer of data relating to criminal offenders, suspects or persons incarcerated by the law enforcement agencies" (Paragraph 55).

Michael does not explicitly teach:

B) wherein said plurality of databases comprise: a calling services database.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise: a calling services database"** as "Each time an inmate places a call from a correctional facility, a call detail record (CDR) of the call is created. The call detail records of inmate calls typically include the name of the inmate (and/or inmate identification number), the inmate's location, the number called and the date, time and duration of the call" (Paragraph 5) and "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211" (Paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies by viewing outgoing/incoming telephone call transcripts, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 9, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise contacts information.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise contacts information"** as

"Each time an inmate places a call from a correctional facility, a call detail record (CDR) of the call is created. The call detail records of inmate calls typically include the name of the inmate (and/or inmate identification number), the inmate's location, the number called and the date, time and duration of the call" (Paragraph 5), "The system may be programmed to automatically record the names of all inmates who call a telephone number that has been associated with a particular SECURITY THREAT GROUP" (Paragraph 25), and "Called Number" (Paragraph 77, Figures 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 12, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise end party information.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise end party information"** as "Each time an inmate places a call from a correctional facility, a call detail record (CDR) of the call is created. The call detail records of inmate calls typically include the name of the inmate (and/or inmate identification number), the inmate's location, the number called and the date, time and duration of the call" (Paragraph 5), "The system may be programmed to automatically record the names of all inmates who call a telephone number that has been associated with a particular SECURITY THREAT.GROUP" (Paragraph 25), and "Called Number" (Paragraph 77, Figures 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal

offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies by viewing outgoing/incoming telephone call transcripts, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 14, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise initial contact information.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise initial contact information"** as "Each time an inmate places a call from a correctional facility, a call detail record (CDR) of the call is created. The call detail records of inmate calls typically include the name of the inmate (and/or inmate identification number), the inmate's location, the number called and the date, time and duration of the call" (Paragraph 5), "The system may be programmed to automatically record the names of all inmates who call a telephone number that has been associated with a particular SECURITY THREAT GROUP" (Paragraph 25), and "STG code" (Paragraph 78, Figures 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies by viewing outgoing/incoming telephone call transcripts, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 20, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically showing details with respect to the relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically showing details with respect to the relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25) and "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to determine whether related criminal activity can be ascertained, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 21, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said graphical details comprise a relative strength of the relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data shown using a line therebetween.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said graphical details comprise a relative strength of the relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data shown using a line therebetween"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records

or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25) and "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to determine whether related criminal activity can be ascertained, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 22, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented to show a relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented to show a relationship between said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25) and "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to determine whether related criminal activity can be ascertained, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 23, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented as an alert to said user to notify said user of a condition of interest to said user.

Crites, however, teaches "**wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are presented as an alert to said user to notify said user of a condition of interest to said user**" as "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136) and "a designated party is notified of the potential security threat, and/or filtered or unfiltered report is generated" (Paragraph 137).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to provide an immediate notification of criminal relationships, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 24, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said user is one of a plurality of users to which said alert is broadcast.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said user is one of a plurality of users to which said alert is broadcast"** as "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136) and "a designated party is notified of the potential security threat, and/or filtered or unfiltered report is generated" (Paragraph 137).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that a **"designated party"** (Paragraph 137) consists of multiple users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to provide an immediate notification of criminal relationships, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 26, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said utilizing said information vector data to identify at least a portion of said useful data and said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data to identify another portion of said useful data are performed after an event for post-event analysis of data.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said utilizing said information vector data to identify at least a portion of said useful data and said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data to identify another portion of said useful data are performed after an event for post-event analysis of data"** as "If a security threat group correlation is discovered, close attention to the activities of that security threat group can be paid" (Paragraph 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer

system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to facilitate the investigation of potential crimes, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 27, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said utilizing said information vector data to identify at least a portion of said useful data and said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data to identify another portion of said useful data are performed before an event for pre-event analysis of data.

Crites, however, teaches "**wherein said utilizing said information vector data to identify at least a portion of said useful data and said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data to identify another portion of said useful data are performed before an event for pre-event analysis of data**" as "The information may be specific to a particular inmate or may be general and involve as yet unspecified inmates such as the location of a crime or an unidentified security threat group activity. Examples of such intelligence may include inmate security threat group affiliation, pending or prior drug deals, murder, extortion, or the like" (Paragraph 31) and "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to facilitate the investigation of potential crimes, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 28, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said pre-event analysis of data is utilized to proactively identify problems.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said pre-event analysis of data is utilized to proactively identify problems"** as "Using the present invention, a database of telephone numbers of DOC employees, contractors and other persons engaged in business on the DOC premises, for example, may be rapidly compared with inmate telephone activities to determine whether an inmate may be calling any such persons" (Paragraph 26) and "The information may be specific to a particular inmate or may be general and involve as yet unspecified inmates such as the location of a crime or an unidentified security threat group activity. Examples of such intelligence may include inmate security threat group affiliation, pending or prior drug deals, murder, extortion, or the like" (Paragraph 31) and "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136).

The examiner notes that by identifying "pending drug deals" (Paragraph 31), a user is acting **"proactively"** to prevent crimes and problems.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to facilitate the investigation of potential crimes, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 29, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data from said at least one database to access at least another database of said plurality of databases to identify another portion of said useful data therein comprises pattern matching to identify said another portion of said useful data.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said utilizing said at least a portion of said useful data from said at least one database to access at least another**

database of said plurality of databases to identify another portion of said useful data therein comprises pattern matching to identify said another portion of said useful data" as "While making a query the investigator can also display the following: How many other inmates are or have been calling the numbers that the specific inmate is calling, who they are, and where they are located" (Paragraphs 33-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to relate crimes, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 30, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are utilized in automatically identifying an individual as a potential suspect in an investigation.

Crites, however, teaches "**wherein said at least a portion of said useful data and said another portion of said useful data are utilized in automatically identifying an individual as a potential suspect in an investigation**" as "Using the present invention, a database of telephone numbers of DOC employees, contractors and other persons engaged in business on the DOC premises, for example, may be rapidly compared with inmate telephone activities to determine whether an inmate may be calling any such persons" (Paragraph 26) and "queries can be automated, and based on, for example, a profile, where for example, inmates with known security threat potential can be monitored more closely then other inmates" (Paragraph 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer

system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to relate crimes, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 31, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said at least a portion of said useful data comprises particular content of a communication selected from the group consisting of a telephone call, a video communication, and an electronic mail communication.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said at least a portion of said useful data comprises particular content of a communication selected from the group consisting of a telephone call, a video communication, and an electronic mail communication"** as "in general the systems and methods of this invention can be used with any demographic in any environment to monitor any type of electronic communication including, but not limited to telephone calls, e-mail, instant messaging, electronic chat, paging, or the like" (Paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to view criminal activity in a variety of media, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 40, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically showing details with respect to relationships between said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and other data graphically presented.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically showing details with respect to relationships between said relevant**

data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and other data graphically presented" as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25), "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28), and "results could be sorted by security threat group codes" (Paragraph 100).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to simply depict criminal activity via a graphical user interface, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 41, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein said graphical details comprise a relative strength of the relationship between said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and said other data graphically presented shown using a line therebetween.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said graphical details comprise a relative strength of the relationship between said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and said other data graphically presented shown using a line therebetween"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25) and "The search can

return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to simply depict criminal activity via a graphical user interface, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 42, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically representing availability of data related to said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and other data graphically presented.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said graphical presentation includes graphically representing availability of data related to said relevant data for which said confluence of search information vectors are identified and other data graphically presented"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25) and "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information

form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to simply depict criminal activity via a graphical user interface, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 43, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein said related data comprises content of a communication between individuals.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said related data comprises content of a communication between individuals"** as "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211 and attempts to determine whether there are correlations. Some of the correlations may be determined automatically" (Paragraph 25), "The search can return any correlations between inmate telephone activity and known security threat groups or, for example, just that inmate's telephone activity data" (Paragraph 28), and "the investigator may listen to one or more calls, since all inmate calls are recorded and logged" (Paragraph 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 44, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein said related data comprises an icon representing a form of communication between individuals.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said related data comprises an icon representing a form of communication between individuals"** as "called number" (Figures 3-4) and "BNA" (Figures 3-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to simply depict criminal activity via a graphical user interface, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 45, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) presenting an alert to a user as a result of identifying said confluence of search information.

Crites, however, teaches **"presenting an alert to a user as a result of identifying said confluence of search information"** as "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136) and "a designated party is notified of the potential security threat, and/or filtered or unfiltered report is generated" (Paragraph 137).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that a **"designated party"** (Paragraph 137) consists of multiple users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to provide an immediate notification of criminal relationships, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 46, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein said confluence of search information indicates a condition for which said user has subscribed to alert notifications.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said confluence of search information indicates a condition for which said user has subscribed to alert notifications"** as "a determination is made whether the monitored communications meet the qualifications for being flagged as a security threat" (Paragraph 136) and "a designated party is notified of the potential security threat, and/or filtered or unfiltered report is generated" (Paragraph 137).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that a **"designated party"** (Paragraph 137) has to subscribe for notifications in order to receive them.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies in order to provide an immediate notification of criminal relationships, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 51, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise a calling services database

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise a calling services database"** as "Each time an inmate places a call from a correctional facility, a call detail record (CDR) of the call is created. The call detail records of inmate calls typically include the name of the inmate (and/or inmate identification number), the inmate's location, the number called and the date, time and duration of the call" (Paragraph 5) and "the security threat group database server 210 obtains and stores

Customer Detail Records or Call Detail Records (CDR's) for inmates from the DOC facilities covered by the system from one or more CDR databases 211" (Paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Crites's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide information regarding criminal offenders committing crimes in a first geographic area of the country on a computer system and method which enables one law enforcement agency to access information form another law enforcement agency allowing the simple transfer of data between the two agencies, as noted by **Crites** (Paragraph 6).

5.   Claims 4, 13, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Michael** (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0070076) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-11, 15-19, 25, 32-39, 47-50, 52, and 54 and in view of **Brown et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,485,507).

6.   Regarding claim 4, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein said plurality of databases further comprise a commissary services database.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases further comprise a commissary services database"** as "The commissary system is accessed from selected telephone stations of the premise-based telephone system by entering a commissary access number. When the telephone station is connected to the commissary system, the user is prompted by the voice generating device to enter a personal identifier which the processor uses to access user status information stored in the memory device. The user status information includes, for example, the user name, account balances, and user class which determine the scope of the user's commissary privileges" (Column 2, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Brown's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide an automated system to process

and determine commissary orders from incarcerated felons in prison, as noted by **Brown** (Column 1, lines 41-51).

Regarding claim 13, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise flow of funds information.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein search information vectors for which said search information vector data is accepted comprise flow of funds information"** as "The commissary system is accessed from selected telephone stations of the premise-based telephone system by entering a commissary access number. When the telephone station is connected to the commissary system, the user is prompted by the voice generating device to enter a personal identifier which the processor uses to access user status information stored in the memory device. The user status information includes, for example, the user name, account balances, and user class which determine the scope of the user's commissary privileges" (Column 2, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Brown's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide an automated system to process and determine commissary orders from incarcerated felons in prison, as noted by **Brown** (Column 1, lines 41-51).

Regarding claim 53, **Michael** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein said plurality of databases comprise a commissary services database.

Crites, however, teaches **"wherein said plurality of databases comprise a commissary services database"** as "The commissary system is accessed from selected telephone stations of the premise-based telephone system by entering a commissary access number. When the telephone station is connected to the commissary system, the user is prompted by the voice generating device to enter a personal identifier which the processor uses to access user status information stored in

the memory device. The user status information includes, for example, the user name, account balances, and user class which determine the scope of the user's commissary privileges" (Column 2, lines 12-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Brown's** would have allowed **Michael's** to provide an automated system to process and determine commissary orders from incarcerated felons in prison, as noted by **Brown** (Column 1, lines 41-51).

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 0919/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant goes on to argue on page 10, that **"Michael simply does not teach providing electronic access to a plurality of databases"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 37-39, 41, and 49 of **Michael** which state "The system includes a computing system 21 in communication with a plurality of law enforcement agencies 22, 24, and 26" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further wishes to point to Paragraph 42 of Michael which states "The computing system 21 may be any conventional computer having the necessary computing power to store data within **one or more databases** and provide calculations and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42). The examiner further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method clearly uses multiple databases since the input terminals in the various law

enforcement agencies provide/receive data. The examiner further wishes to state that it is common knowledge that data is stored in tables/databases in computer systems. The examiner further wishes to state that **Michael's** method clearly allows for parties of a justice database system to view and receive data from other parties (see "all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on page 10, that **"In addition to Michael not teaching providing access to a plurality of databases, the disclosure of Michael cannot be read to render the foregoing obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103"**. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the controller of Nilsen by applying the teachings of Subramanyam and Smith, III as indicated above, to enhance its performance. It would have been obvious to evaluate the information regarding the I/O operations to distribute the loads to the database server and to cache the information at the controller because Smith, III teaches that the I/O operations constitute a major portion of OLTP workload and thus caching the I/O operations would help avoid expensive disk accesses (Smith, III, col. 2, lines 30-32).

In response to applicant's argument on pages 4 and 6, *a prima facie case of obviousness* is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some

teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

. "Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, -1181

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Applicant goes on to argue on page 11, that **"However, Michael expressly teaches that the information of the plurality of law enforcement agencies is available to other law enforcement agencies only through a single shared database"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 37-39, 41, and 49 of **Michael** which state "The system includes a computing system 21 in communication with a plurality of law enforcement agencies 22, 24, and 26" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input

terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further wishes to point to Paragraph 42 of Michael which states "The computing system 21 may be any conventional computer having the necessary computing power to store data within **one or more databases** and provide calculations and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42). The examiner further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method clearly uses multiple databases since the input terminals in the various law enforcement agencies provide/receive data. The examiner further wishes to state that it is common knowledge that data is stored in tables/databases in computer systems. The examiner further wishes to state that **Michael's** method clearly allows for parties of a justice database system to view and receive data from other parties (see "all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on page 12, that **"Applicant asserts, however, that the foregoing data field names are not meta data, but rather are the database data field names"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraph 49 of Michael which states "The computer system 21 may categorize all data, including images, into specific Meta Data designator fields...Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further wishes to state that **Michael's** method clearly allows a user to search for all data stored in the various databases (see "may categorize **all data**, including images, into specific Meta Data designator fields" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on page 12, that **"Moreover, there is nothing in the disclosure of Michael to teach or suggest that a user can search for the foregoing field names (as opposed to the data stored in the data field of the respective data field name) as proffered by the Examiner"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraph 49 of Michael which states "The computer system 21 may categorize all data, including images, into specific Meta Data designator fields...Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data contained within the database 50" (Paragraph 49).

The examiner further wishes to state that **Michael's** method clearly allows a user to search for all data stored in the various databases (see "may categorize **all data**, including images, into specific Meta Data designator fields" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on page 12, that **"Although Michael teaches categorizing data into specific meta data designator fields (specifically author, title, and version) and that a user can search for individuals based on the meta data fields, paragraph 049, there is nothing in this disclosure to meet the claim language reciting identifying confluence of search information vectors of the plurality of search information vectors"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 42, 47, and 49, and Figures 7, 12, and 19 of **Michael** which state "The computing system 21...computing power to store data within one ore more databases and provide calculations and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42), "FIG. 19 is a table 225 illustrating data correlating alias names associated with criminal offenders" (Paragraph 47), "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for. The examiner further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method clearly uses different meta fields to calculate and determine correlations as well as provide differing meta fields to find cross references between criminals.

Applicant goes on to argue on page 12, that **"Claim 47 recites "a plurality of geographically dispersed...Michael is completely silent with respect to any database or databases"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 37-39, 41, and 49 of **Michael** which state "The system includes a computing system 21 in communication with a plurality of law enforcement agencies 22, 24, and 26" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39), "The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for

storing data received form the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their
associated input terminals" (Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system
20 may query all data contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the
subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).
The examiner further wishes to point to Paragraph 42 of Michael which states "The
computing system 21 may be any conventional computer having the necessary
computing power to store data within **one or more databases** and provide calculations
and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42). The examiner
further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method clearly uses multiple databases since
the input terminals in the various law enforcement agencies provide/receive data. The
examiner further wishes to state that it is common knowledge that data is stored in
tables/databases in computer systems. The examiner further wishes to state that
Michael's method clearly allows for parties of a justice database system to view and
receive data from other parties (see "all data from all the subscribing law enforcement
agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on page 12, that **"Michael teaches only a single
database which is accessible by the plurality of law enforcement agencies"**.
However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 37-39, 41, and 49 of **Michael**
which state "The system includes a computing system 21 in communication with a
plurality of law enforcement agencies 22, 24, and 26" (Paragraph 37), "Within each law
enforcement agency may be a plurality of input terminals" (Paragraph 38), "Each input
terminal (30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) may be any device which allows a terminal
operator to provide data or receive data from the computing system 21" (Paragraph 39),
"The computing system 21 also includes a database 50 for storing data received form
the plurality of law enforcement agencies and their associated input terminals"
(Paragraph 41), and "Operators subscribing to the system 20 may query all data
contained within the database 50. Thus, all data from all the subscribing law
enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49). The examiner
further wishes to point to Paragraph 42 of Michael which states "The computing system
21 may be any conventional computer having the necessary computing power to store

data within **one or more databases** and provide calculations and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42). The examiner further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method clearly uses multiple databases since the input terminals in the various law enforcement agencies provide/receive data. The examiner further wishes to state that it is common knowledge that data is stored in tables/databases in computer systems. The examiner further wishes to state that **Michael's** method clearly allows for parties of a justice database system to view and receive data from other parties (see "all data from all the subscribing law enforcement agencies is available to all subscribers" (Paragraph 49).

Applicant goes on to argue on pages 12-13, that **"Moreover, because the principle of operation set forth...are not sufficient to render the claims *prima face* obvious"**. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the controller of Nilsen by applying the teachings of Subramanyam and Smith, III as indicated above, to enhance its performance. It would have been obvious to evaluate the information regarding the I/O operations to distribute the loads to the database server and to cache the information at the controller because Smith, III teaches that the I/O operations constitute a major portion of OLTP workload and thus caching the I/O operations would help avoid expensive disk accesses (Smith, III, col. 2, lines 30-32).

In response to applicant's argument on pages 4 and 6, *a prima facie case of obviousness* is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once

such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, <u>test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art</u>."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, -1181

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Applicant goes on to argue on page 13, that **"the disclosure of Michael identified by the Examiner does not address the claim limitation regarding using data identified as directly relevant to an information vector to further identify data indirectly relevant to the information vector"**. However, the examiner wishes to point to Paragraphs 42, 47, and 49, and Figures 7, 12, and 19 of **Michael** which state "The computing system 21...computing power to store data within one ore more

databases and provide calculations and correlations based on the stored and inputted data" (Paragraph 42), "FIG. 19 is a table 225 illustrating data correlating alias names associated with criminal offenders" (Paragraph 47), "By utilizing Meta Data designator fields, an operator of the system 20 may search for individuals based on the Meta Data fields associated with each type of data...may query all data contained within the database 50" (Paragraph 49). The examiner further notes that "charge" (Figure 7), "HairColor" (Figure 12), "Identifying note" (Figure 12), and "RelativeFirstName" (Figure 12) all depict different meta fields for a user to search for. The examiner further wishes to state that the **Michael's** method allows a user to query all information regarding a particular criminal. The examiner further wishes to state that by returning all information regarding a criminal, indirectly relevant data would be returned as well.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 7,039,171 issued to **Gickler** on 02 May 2006. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database)..

U.S. PGPUB 2001/0036821 issued to **Gainesboro et al.** on 01 November 2001. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database)

U.S. PGPUB 2002/0069084 issued to **Donovan** on 06 January 2002. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database).

U.S. Patent 6,173,284 issued to **Brown** on 09 January 2001. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database).

Article entitled "COPLINK: A CASE OF INTELLIGENT ANALYSIS AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT", by **Hauck et al.**, published in 1999. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database).

Article entitled "Building an Infrastructure for Law Enforcement Information Sharing and Collaboration: Design Issues and Challenges", by **Chau et al.**, published in 2001. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-54 (e.g., methods to monitor inmate communications in a correctional facility using a database).

12.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mahesh Dwivedi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2731. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:20 am – 4:40 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached (571) 272-3642. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mahesh Dwivedi

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2168

November 14, 2006

Leslie Wong LW

Primary Examiner

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100